



Setti D. Warren
Mayor

City of Newton, Massachusetts
Department of Planning and Development
1000 Commonwealth Avenue Newton, Massachusetts 02459

Telephone
(617) 796-1120
Telefax
(617) 796-1142
TDD/TTY
(617) 796-1089
www.newtonma.gov

Candace Havens
Director

**MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARINGS
NEWTON UPPER FALLS HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**

DATE: April 10, 2014

PLACE/TIME: City Hall, Cafeteria
7:30 p.m.

ATTENDING: Larry Schwirian, Chairman
Jeff Riklin, Member
Jay Walter, Member
Don Lang, Member
Laurie Malcom, Member
Barbara Kurze, Commission Staff
Katy Hax Holmes, Staff
See Attendance List

ABSENT: Seta Der Hohannesian, Secretary
Paul Snyder, Member
Beth Corr, Alternate
John Sales, Alternate

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 pm with Larry Schwirian serving as Chairman. Voting permanent members were Larry Schwirian, Jeff Riklin, Jay Walter, Don Lang and Laurie Malcom. B. Kurze acted as recording secretary and the meeting was digitally recorded on an H2 Zoom recording device.

365-385 Elliot Street – Certificate of Appropriateness

The applicants did not attend the meeting.

Materials Reviewed:

Photos

Commission members had questions about the application. Staff said she would notify the owner and applicant that the application will need to be reviewed at a future regularly scheduled meeting.

1029 Chestnut Street – Certificate of Appropriateness

Maureen Wall, representing the building owner and the business owner, presented an application to install two signs: one on the brick façade facing Chestnut Street and one on the walkway railing leading to the commercial space. M. Wall stated that she met with the Urban Design Committee on April 9, 2014, and that the committee requested she alter the business sign proposed for the railing to include the street address so that there would only be one sign at the railing location. M. Wall showed mockups of the revised sign combining the business sign and street address at the walkway railing location and provided a hard copy.

Materials Reviewed:

Photos

J. Riklin asked about the materials for the proposed gable end sign; M. Wall stated that the signs would be white PVC with black lettering. J. Walter and L. Schwirian commented that both the gable end sign and the revised combined sign for the walkway railing location fit in well. J. Riklin noted that the walkway railing sign was near the upper part of the parking lot and that it would be unobtrusive. D. Lang and L. Shwirian asked if there would be a border around the gable end sign as this might make the sign more visible against the building; M. Wall stated that there would be a border around the top section of the sign as shown in the image. D. Lang commented that the design was nice and clean.

J. Riklin motioned to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as submitted. L. Malcom seconded the motion. This motion was passed unanimously, 5-0.

RECORD OF ACTION:

DATE: April 10, 2014

SUBJECT: 1029 Chestnut Street - Certificate of Appropriateness

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on April 10, 2014 the Newton Upper Falls Historic District Commission, by vote of 5-0,

RESOLVED to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as submitted at 1029 Chestnut Street to install two signs: one on the brick façade facing Chestnut Street and one on the walkway railing leading to the commercial space. The revised design that was presented and reviewed at the meeting will be used for the walkway railing location.

Voting in the Affirmative:

Larry Schwirian, Chairman

Jeff Riklin, Member

Jay Walter, Member

Don Lang, Member

Laurie Malcom, Alternate

72 Cottage Street – Certificate of Appropriateness

Representatives from the owner of the property (Emerald Green Development, LLC), Arthur Choo and Aaron Breen, presented the project that was first presented at the March meeting. A. Choo, the architect for the project, presented the redesign to make the front elevation more asymmetrical as requested at the last meeting; he identified the revisions to the drawings as follows:

- Window locations were changed to create an asymmetrical look consistent with the eclectic collection of windows on the original house.
- Window and dormer groupings were changed.
- Front step relationship was changed.
- Front porch was changed to make it less symmetrical.
- Dormers were changed.
- Materials were listed on the drawings. These included:
 - Windows were identified as all wood
 - Front porch railings were changed to mahogany
 - Siding was identified as Hardie Board or cement board

Materials Reviewed:

Photos

Plans

Elevations

L. Schwirian asked whether the features drawn on the front elevation edges were corner boards or downspouts; A. Choo stated they were downspouts. L. Schwirian asked if that meant corner boards were not included and D. Lang asked what siding was under the asbestos shingles; A. Choo replied that the original siding was clapboard. J. Walter stated that the new siding should match the same exposure as the original clapboard; A. Choo said that the intent was to match the existing exposure and that they could do further investigation to understand what the original siding was. The Commission members expressed a preference for corner board and J. Riklin specified five-quarter x six-inch corner board with a four-inch exposure. A. Choo agreed that they could do corner boards. D. Lang asked whether the Commission members considered Hardie Board an acceptable material; Commission members responded that the Commission had approved Hardie Board and cement board for previous projects.

L. Schwirian asked what material was identified for the front doors; A. Choo stated that they would be mahogany wood. J. Riklin asked if the windows were authentic or simulated divided-lights. A. Breen and A. Choo stated that they would use Anderson 400 simulated divided-light windows with energy panels; the mullion would be mechanically attached on the exterior and would have a spacer bar; the window trim would be PVC. According to Commission members, the Anderson 400 window had a vinyl-clad exterior and wood interior. J. Walter requested the specification sheet for the windows. L. Schwirian expressed a preference for cement fiberboard for the window trim and J. Riklin specified five-quarter inch board for the window trim. J. Riklin also requested that if PVC was used that it should not look shiny or plastic; A. Breen and A. Choo stated that the trim would be painted; the Commission members noted that if the PVC was painted then shininess should not be an issue.

J. Riklin asked if the porch columns would be round fiberglass; A. Choo confirmed that the columns would be painted fiberglass. J. Riklin and J. Walter asked if the base of the porch would be open or closed; A. Breen and A. Choo stated that it would be lattice.

Commission members noted that the building had been a barn and most likely was post and beam construction; they also noted that another project in the historic district that involved a post and

beam structure got very complicated because the applicants were not prepared to deal with the structure; J. Riklin added that there would be public concern about preserving an original post and beam structure. A. Choo and A. Breen responded that the framework was not currently exposed, so they did not know whether the structure was post and beam, but if it became an issue they would have a structural engineer look at it.

D. Lang stated that the roof would have to come off to build the second floor and asked if all the exterior walls would come down as well; A. Breen and A. Choo replied that if the second floor was structurally sound and could be added to, then they would keep the structure. D. Lang asked if the second floor deck would remain; A. Breen replied that if they discovered that it was not level or secure, then they would replace it. D. Lang asked about the condition of the foundation; A. Breen stated that the foundation was secure and adequate to remain.

D. Lang expressed concern that the entire building would get demolished in order to execute the revised plans; L. Schwirian commented that he did not believe this was the intent. J. Walter noted that the applicants had not done a thorough investigation or a structural analysis. A. Breen stated that they were still working on cleaning out the building which had been a major task.

A. Breen noted that there was a hole in the front section that must be dealt with. J. Riklin stated that the front right corner of the structure was gone and that the walls were wide open to the interior; the entire corner would have to be rebuilt and major structural work would probably be required. A. Breen said that they would have a structural engineer make sure that it was safe and structurally sound.

D. Lang recommended that it be stated in the motion that the applicants should keep as much of the original structure as possible and repair what needed to be repaired; they should not demolish the entire structure to recreate the revised architectural drawings; he would not want the entire structure demolished unnecessarily similar to what happened at 1012-1018 Chestnut Street. K. Holmes identified herself as a Newton resident who worked for the City of Newton and recommended that the Commission members ask the owners to do the structural analysis and then come back with a plan that would reflect existing conditions; she noted that the current revised plan addressed appearance without any knowledge of structural conditions. The Commission members agreed that they should get the structural analysis first; L. Malcom stated that the Commission members should get hard copies of the report from structural engineer and also see the site.

J. Riklin commented that the Commission members appreciated the design work and the changes that were made at Commission members' request at the last meeting; the issue was not with what was presented but with what might be discovered that could preclude executing the revised design. J. Walter stated that the design was much improved and proposed that the Commission members approve the revised design and make the approval conditional based on the structural report to be provided before actual demolition work could begin; if most of the structure would have to be replaced then they would have to come back in front of the Commission; this would allow the project to move forward. A. Breen said this would be acceptable. D. Lang commented that everyone would benefit from the process of making sure there were no surprises and that the project could move forward without unexpected delays. A. Breen stated that they would get a structural engineering

report once everything had been exposed and that the structural engineer would identify what would be kept and what would be replaced.

D. Lang stated that the Commission members understood that the roof would have to go and their assumption was that the first floor would stay and that the gable ends might remain. A. Breen asked what the impact would be if the two-by-four framing on the exterior had to be removed. J. Walter stated that infill two-by-four would not be a problem; however, taking down the timber structure would be a problem. J. Walter stated that they should preserve the integrity of the original structure as much as possible; he would look for the structural engineer to verify that most of the original structure would remain. D. Lang commented that from a marketing standpoint, preserving original timber floors and keeping original timber frame exposed would add value.

L. Schwirian opened the meeting to public comment. Nina Kochs, an abutter who lives at 70 Cottage Street, expressed concern that a new home might be built on an unsound structure. N. Kochs commented that the symmetrical design looked nicer and that the asymmetrical redesign looked contrived; she showed Commission members a photograph of the gable end. J. Walter asked whether the gable end faced N. Kochs' property; N. Kochs confirmed that it did. J. Riklin asked what changes would make the design work for N. Kochs; N. Kochs did not have a specific recommendation. J. Walter commented that the original proposal was relentlessly symmetrical and was not within the character of the original building; this revised design did a good job of breaking symmetry and having an ordered façade. J. Walter and L. Malcolm stated that the revised design was acceptable and balanced. J. Riklin said that the Commission members appreciated the concern, but the applicant and architect did what was requested and the Commission members were comfortable with the result. D. Lang stated that it was to the credit of the architects to have designed something less formal, but still orderly that resulted in a rather handsome façade with a doubled side and a grouped side.

J. Riklin motioned to accept the revised drawings with these provisos: 1) that the applicants submit a report from a structural engineer that spells out what is required to be replaced; 2) that the architect confirm that corner boards are included; 3) that the new Hardie Plank siding will match the original clapboard in terms of the spacing; and 4) that the windows will be simulated divided-lights with attached mullions and with spacer bars. D. Lang seconded the motion. This motion was passed unanimously, 5-0.

RECORD OF ACTION:

DATE: April 10, 2014

SUBJECT: 72 Cottage Street - Certificate of Appropriateness

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on April 10, 2014 the Newton Upper Falls Historic District Commission, by vote of 5-0,

RESOLVED to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as submitted with the revised drawings at 72 Cottage Street to renovate a house and add dormers with the following provisos: 1) that the applicants submit a report from a structural engineer that spells out what is required to be replaced; 2) that the architect confirm that corner boards are included; 3) that the new Hardie Plank siding will match the original clapboard in terms of the spacing; 4) that the windows will be simulated divided-lights with attached mullions and with spacer bars; and 5) that the opening and door on the

front elevation to the left side of the basement façade will be removed and the foundation portion will be filled in with fieldstone to match what is currently existing, and the rest of the opening will be infilled.

Voting in the Affirmative:

Larry Schwirian, Chairman
Don Lang, Member

Jeff Riklin, Member
Laurie Malcom, Alternate

Jay Walter, Member

N. Kochs asked whether the two separate decks on the rear elevation could be combined; the Commission members stated that was not possible because there was a bulkhead in between.

D. Lang asked what would happen with the large opening in the front elevation to the left of the porch and under the two single windows. A. Breen said that it would be filled with existing fieldstone material; they would remove the door and enclose the foundation. J. Riklin stated that they should put the rubble foundation back and infill the opening and that this should be indicated on the drawings. J. Riklin motioned that this requirement be added to the previous motion: the opening and door on the front elevation to the left side of the basement façade will be removed and the foundation portion will be filled in with fieldstone to match what currently exists, and the rest of the opening will be infilled. D. Lang seconded the motion. This motion was passed unanimously, 5-0.

22 Winter Street – Certificate of Appropriateness

Gilon Levert and Jack Foster (Historic Chestnut Hill LLC) presented the project which incorporated the changes requested by the Commission members in the previous meeting. The Commission members noted that they did not have the revised drawings and materials; G. Levert provided hard copies.

G. Levert identified the changes made to the drawings since the last meeting as follows:

- Changed windows from nine over nine and six over six to two over two.
- Matched window sizes to first floor windows where possible.
- Did not change size of second story window on the side but changed to two over two.
- The Commission requested that the proposed double entry door within the inset on the front (street) elevation be changed to a single door and that the door on the right be removed. G. Levert presented two options: one with the door in the middle and one with the door on the left. Commission members stated that they should follow the option with the door on the left.
- Changed the octagonal windows on the left side of rear elevation to square windows; one would be for the bathroom and one for the stairway. Note: G. Levert stated that the octagonal windows would be replaced with two over two windows; however, the drawing and drawing detail identified the replacement windows as square.
- Changed drawings to show material details; G. Levert described the following:
 - Roof materials – asphalt shingle, architectural series.
 - Windows – Brosco window units, two over two, wood. Window units would include one x five-inch flat trim casing, one x three-quarter-inch pine band molding, one x five-inch pine exterior corner board, one x 12-inch pine soffit, one x six-inch pine fascia piece.

Materials Reviewed:

Photos

Elevations

J. Walter commented that the drawings were poor quality and that the eave conditions depicted on the 3-D drawing were not clear; he asked if the cornice went across the eave on the right side or if there was an eave under the dormer. G. Levert stated that the back was flat all the way up. D. Lang noted that wall continued up so there would be no need for an eave except as an added detail.

J. Riklin commented that there were no drawings of existing conditions. J. Riklin asked for verification that the exterior siding would be removed and re-cladded and that the windows would not be moved around and that the octagonal windows would be replaced with rectangular windows. G. Levert stated that they would add several windows: two to the elevation facing 1012-1018 Chestnut Street, one facing Winter Street and one in back.

D. Lang asked if the dormer was in the same plane as the sidewall; he commented that it would be better to keep a piece of roof going across the dormer. G. Levert noted that the dormer was a new addition.

Discussion ensued as to whether gutters were appropriate as the original building most likely would not have had gutters. D. Lang commented that without gutters the building would have had a deep overhang; there could be a 12-inch soffit for the overhang. J. Riklin stated that they should keep the overhang and several courses of roof shingles between the dormer and the roof edge. J. Walter concurred that the building should not require gutters so that they could maintain the current eaves.

J. Foster asked whether siding should be cedar or cement board; J. Riklin stated could use either and recommended one inch x nine inch corner boards and window trim, and five-quarter x six inch (otherwise would be too thick). J. Riklin asked about the band around the trim; G. Levert replied that this was what he saw on similar houses. J. Riklin noted that this was not appropriate as would not find this on a barn; he recommended that they keep it simple and use five-quarter x five inch flat stock for the window casing and not use the band around the trim. D. Lang noted that there was a corner board on the building now and that they should match the smaller corner board. J. Riklin recommended that they not use pine; they should use poplar as that would hold up better. L. Schwirian recommended cedar. J. Riklin stated that if they used Hardie Plank that they should use AZEK five-quarter PVC; if they used clapboard or shingles then they should use wood corner board. D. Lang requested that the finish maintain the character of simplicity of the barn; J. Walter noted that they could paint AZEK and requested that they keep the finish true to the original structure which had the trim and body in the same color.

J. Walter stated that they should match the eave; the dormer should have the same eave details with the same overhangs and rafter tails. J. Riklin stated that the existing roof detail should be replicated in the dormer.

D. Lang commented that the recessed entryway was probably not the original and had probably been installed when the barn was converted to a residence. J. Riklin noted that they should use PVC for the

trim if decided to go with Hardie Plank and should keep the trim consistent with the windows and doors. J. Foster stated that the existing nine panel door was steel and that they would like to keep it. J. Walter noted that the door did not have mutins; J. Riklin recommended that the doors be replaced.

D. Lang asked about the trash enclosure that was a special condition of the permit; G. Levert and J. Foster stated that this had already been approved.

J. Riklin noted that neighbors had asked how many units were in the building; J. Foster stated that there would be two – one commercial unit in the basement (currently used for storage) and one residential unit on the first and second floors. J. Riklin asked about parking; J. Foster stated that the city had granted 18 spots.

J. Riklin motioned to approve the plans as submitted with the following clarifications: 1) that the front and rear replacement doors would be wood doors with true divided-lights with an energy panel (fiberglass doors would not be acceptable); 2) that the exterior siding would be five-quarter inch thick and would either be Hardie Plank with PVC corner boards that would match the exposure and size of the existing corner boards, or clapboard siding with five-quarter inch thick corner boards that would match the exposure and size of the existing siding; 3) that the dormer on the right side of the house would have rooflines that matched the existing rooflines, dormer roof details that matched the existing roof details, and that the dormer would be set so that several courses of roof shingles existed between the edge of the dormer and the outer edge of the roof; 4) that the casings around the windows and doors would be five-quarter x five-inch flat stock; and 5) there would be no gutters. J. Walter seconded the motion. This motion was passed unanimously, 5-0.

RECORD OF ACTION:

DATE: April 10, 2014

SUBJECT: 22 Winter Street - Certificate of Appropriateness

At a scheduled meeting and public hearing on April 10, 2014 the Newton Upper Falls Historic District Commission, by vote of 5-0,

RESOLVED to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as submitted with the revised drawings at 22 Winter Street to renovate a building with the following clarifications: 1) that the front and rear replacement doors will be wood doors with true divided-lights with an energy panel (fiberglass doors would not be acceptable); 2) that the exterior siding will be five-quarter inch thick and will be either Hardie Plank with PVC corner boards that will match the exposure and size of the existing corner boards, or clapboard siding with five-quarter inch thick corner boards that will match the exposure and size of the existing siding; 3) that the dormer on the right side of the house will have rooflines that match the existing rooflines, dormer roof details that will match the existing roof details, and that the dormer will be set so that several courses of roof shingles exist between the edge of the dormer and the outer edge of the roof; 4) that the casings around the windows and doors will be five-quarter x five-inch flat stock; and 5) there will be no gutters.

Voting in the Affirmative:

Larry Schwirian, Chairman
Don Lang, Member

Jeff Riklin, Member
Laurie Malcom, Alternate

Jay Walter, Member

Nina Kochs, who lives at 70 Cottage Street, commented that she was glad that they were keeping some of the barnlike quality, but wished that they could have kept more.

G. Levert asked for clarification on the dormer; Commission members clarified that the dormer should be in line with the exterior walls and that the face of dormer should line up with face of house.

Administrative Discussion:

Approval of Minutes

The Commission approved the January 2014 and March 2014 minutes by attendees from those meetings who were present at this meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Recorded by Barbara Kurze, Senior Preservation Planner